

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 5-49 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 5 and 10 are amended and claims 29-49 are added. No new matter has been added.

Claims 5 and 10 are amended to clarify the recited subject matter. Support for new claims 29-49 is found throughout the specification, drawing figures, and claims as originally filed. For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Reply to Rejections

A. 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

On page 2, item 1 of the Office Action, claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Claim 5 is amended to obviate the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. 35 U.S.C. §102

On page 3, item 2 of the Office Action, claims 10-12, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,686,536 to Tone et al. (hereinafter “Tone”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In Figures 1 and 6-8 of the Tone reference, the plasma display panel 2 is positioned behind the front plate 1 that contains the various films or layers 4-7. There is a gap between the front plate 1 and the plasma display panel 2. As shown in Figs. 6-8 of Tone, the electroconductive gasket 17 and/or a metal fixing jig further intrude into the gap. As a result, Tone fails to disclose or suggest a plasma display panel, comprising a film type front surface filter formed on a front surface of the panel, as recited in claim 10.

Consequently, claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the applied reference to Tone. Claims 11, 12, 25 and 27, which depend from claim 10, are likewise patentable over Tone for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

C. 35 U.S.C. §103

One page 4, item 3 of the Office Action, claims 13 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tone, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,255,778 to Yoshikawa et al. (hereinafter "Yoshikawa"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Tone is deficient and fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 10, from which claims 13 and 26 depend. Yoshikawa fails to overcome Tone's deficiencies, and further, it would not have been obvious to modify the Tone structure with the Yoshikawa structure to render claim 10 obvious. Thus, the combination of Tone and Yoshikawa fails to render obvious claim 10 from which claims 13 and 26 depend. Consequently,

claims 13 and 26 are also patentable over the combination of Tone, in view Yoshikawa, for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 5, item 4 of the Office Action, claims 5-7, 9, 14-16, 18, 22-24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tone, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,965,191 to Koike et al. (hereinafter “Koike”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As disclosed in Figures 1 and 6-8 of Tone, the front plate 1 and the plasma display panel 2 are similar in length in the side views which would indicate that the front plate 1 and the panel 2 would have similar area or width in a plan view.

Similarly, Koike discloses in various views, such as Figures 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 10, an E-M wave shielding body being a laminate of various transparent layers 10, 20, 31, 40, and 60, all assembled with a coil foil 80, and placed on top of a display area 00 (as seen in Fig. 3). For example, in Figure 3 of Koike, the various layers are narrower or smaller in width than the display area 00. Therefore, none of Tone, Koike or their combination disclose or suggest a plasma display panel, comprising a film type front surface filter disposed at a front surface of a panel to have a wider area than the panel, as recited in claim 5.

Additionally, none of Tone, Koike, or their combination disclose or suggest a plasma display panel, comprising a film type front surface filter disposed at a front surface of the panel, the film type front surface filter having a wider area than that of the panel so that the film type front surface filter has an extended portion in at least part thereof beyond the edges of the panel, as recited in claim 14.

Consequently, claims 5 and 14 are patentable over the applied references, or their combination. Claims 6, 7 and 9 which depend from claim 5, and claims 15, 16, 18, 22-24 and 28, which depend from claim 14, are likewise patentable over the applied references or their combination for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 9, item 5 of the Office Action, claims 8, 17, 19, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tone, in view of Koike, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,255,778 to Yoshikawa. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Tone, Koike, or their combination fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 5 and 14, from which claims 8, 17, 19, 20 and 21 variously depend. Yoshikawa also merely discloses the film and the PDP having the same width, as shown in Fig. 2, for example, and therefore fails to overcome the deficiencies of Tone, Koike, or their combination.

Consequently, claim 8, which depends from claim 5, and claims 17, 19, 20 and 21 which depend from claim 14, are likewise patentable over the applied references or their combination for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. NEW CLAIMS

New claims 29-49 are patentable over the applied references and their combination. Prompt consideration and allowance are also respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Seth S. Kim, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 10/696,996
Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2005

Docket No. HI-0184

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/SSK:kny
Date: MARCH 21, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610